

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO

-----x

In re:

PROMESA  
Title III

THE FINANCIAL OVERSIGHT AND  
MANAGEMENT BOARD FOR PUERTO RICO,

as representative of

No. 17 BK 3283-LTS

THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO,  
et al.,

(Jointly Administered)

Debtors.<sup>1</sup>

-----x

ORDER DENYING COOPERATIVA DE SEGUROS MULTIPLES'  
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF ORDER [ECF NO. 1765]

Before the Court is a motion filed by Cooperativa de Seguros Múltiples de Puerto Rico (“Cooperativa” or “Movant”) for reconsideration of this Court’s order (Docket Entry No. 1765) denying Cooperativa’s motion for clarification of the automatic stay and in the alternative relief from the automatic stay (the “Motion”). (Docket Entry No. 1276.) The Court has carefully considered the submission. For the following reasons, the Motion is denied.

“A motion for reconsideration of a previous order is an extraordinary remedy that must be used sparingly because of interest in finality and conservation of scarce judicial

---

<sup>1</sup> The Debtors in these Title III Cases, along with each Debtor’s respective Title III case number and the last four (4) digits of each Debtor’s federal tax identification number, as applicable, are the (i) Commonwealth of Puerto Rico (Bankruptcy Case No. 17 BK 3283-LTS) (Last Four Digits of Federal Tax ID: 3481); (ii) Puerto Rico Sales Tax Financing Corporation (“COFINA”) (Bankruptcy Case No. 17 BK 3284-LTS) (Last Four Digits of Federal Tax ID: 8474); (iii) Puerto Rico Highways and Transportation Authority (“HTA”) (Bankruptcy Case No. 17 BK 3567-LTS) (Last Four Digits of Federal Tax ID: 3808); (iv) Employees Retirement System of the Government of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico (“ERS”) (Bankruptcy Case No. 17 BK 3566-LTS) (Last Four Digits of Federal Tax ID: 9686); and (v) Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority (“PREPA”) (Bankruptcy Case No. 17 BK 4780-LTS) (Last Four Digits of Federal Tax ID: 3747). (Title III case numbers are listed as Bankruptcy Case numbers due to software limitations).

resources.” In re Pabon Rodriguez, 233 B.R. 212, 220 (Bankr. D.P.R. 1999), aff’d, 2000 WL 35916017 (B.A.P. 1st Cir. 2000), aff’d, 17 F. App’x 5 (1st Cir. 2001). “The movant ‘must either clearly establish a manifest error of law or must present newly discovered evidence.’” Cherena v. Coors Brewing Co., 20 F. Supp. 2d 282, 287 (D.P.R. 1998) (international citations omitted).

Here, Movant has not met the burden of establishing a manifest error of law or proffering newly discovered evidence justifying reconsideration. All of the arguments Movant asserts in the Motion are identical to ones previously made in Cooperativa’s initial motion for clarification of the applicability of the automatic stay and relief from the automatic stay in the alternative and were considered thoroughly by the Court at that time. Movant has not identified any facts overlooked by this Court nor identified any law that was not previously examined by this Court. Movant has made no showing that reconsideration is warranted. Therefore, the Motion is denied.

This Order resolves docket entry no. 1854 in case no. 17-3283.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 5, 2018

/s/ Laura Taylor Swain  
LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN  
United States District Judge